

REMARKS

Interview Summary

A telephonic interview occurred between the Examiner and Applicant's representative, Paul Churilla, on March 21, 2006. The Examiner and Mr. Churilla discussed and reached agreements regarding the claim objections and the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(a) on U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0043741 A1 to Goddard et al. (hereafter "Goddard"). The items discussed and the agreements reached during the interview are discussed below.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1-11 for formal reasons. The Examiner stated that "second mixed signal terminals signal" in claim 1 at line 19 should be replaced with the exact same text. This objection was discussed during the March 21, 2006 interview. The Examiner and Applicant's representative agreed that "second mixed signal terminals signal" in claim 1 at line 19 should be replaced with --second mixed signal terminals--. This correction has been made by the foregoing amendments.

Applicant also amended claim 22 to address a formal issue. Specifically, "second device devices" at line 10 has been replaced with --second device--.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 22, 23 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goddard. The Examiner also rejected claims 8-11 under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Goddard. Applicant respectfully addresses these rejections.

The Examiner and Mr. Churilla discussed these rejections during the March 21, 2006 telephonic interview. The Examiner and Mr. Churilla reached an agreement that Goddard does not disclose or describe transmission gates (claim 1) or signal path circuits (claim 22) that include complementary devices. The Examiner and Mr. Churilla further agreed that amending claims 1 and 22 to recite that the transmission gates and the signal path circuits include complementary devices would overcome the rejections on Goddard. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 22 in accordance with this agreement. Therefore, the rejections under § 102(e) and § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Because an agreement was reached between the Examiner and Mr. Churilla, Applicant does not address the arguments of the Examiner made in the Office action with respect to the rejections under §§ 102 and 103. Applicant, however, does not concede these arguments and reserves the right to address the Examiner's arguments on the merits if and when Goddard is again asserted against the application.

Double Patenting

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-28 of the application based on the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/144,343. Applicant is submitting a terminal disclaimer along with this response to overcome this provisional double patenting rejection. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that all claims now pending in the above referenced application are in condition for allowance. Therefore, an early indication of such allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any formal issues that a telephonic interview would be helpful to resolve, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (360) 379-6514.

Respectfully Submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: March 21, 2006

By: Paul W. Churilla
Paul W. Churilla
Reg. No. 47,495

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing RESPONSE AND INTERVIEW SUMMARY is being deposited as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 21 day of March 2006.

Paul W. Churilla
Paul W. Churilla